arXiv:0910.5045v2 [math.AP] 28 May 2011

Collapsing behaviour of a singular diffusion equation

Kin Ming Hui
Institute of Mathematics, Academia Sinica,
Nankang, Taipei, 11529, Taiwan, R. O. C.

May 27, 2011

Abstract

Let $0 \le u_0(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be such that $u_0(x) = u_0(|x|)$ for all $|x| \ge r_1$ and is monotone decreasing for all $|x| \ge r_1$ for some constant $r_1 > 0$ and $\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\overline{B}_{r_1}(0)} u_0 \ge \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{r_2}(0)} u_0$ for some constant $r_2 > r_1$. Then under some mild decay conditions at infinity on the initial value u_0 we will extend the result of P. Daskalopoulos, M.A. del Pino and N. Sesum [DP2], [DS2], and prove the collapsing behaviour of the maximal solution of the equation $u_t = \Delta \log u$ in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T)$, $u(x,0) = u_0(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$, near its extinction time $T = \int_{R^2} u_0 dx/4\pi$ without using the Hamilton-Yau Harnack inequality.

Key words: collapsing behaviour, maximal solution, singular diffusion equation
AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 35B40 Secondary 35K57, 35K65

0 Introduction

Recently there is a lot of study on the equation,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta \log u, u > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T) \\ u(x,0) = u_0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \end{cases} \tag{0.1}$$

by P. Daskalopoulos, M.A. del Pino and N. Sesum [DP1], [DP2], [DS1], [DS2], S.Y. Hsu [Hs1], [Hs2], [Hs3], [Hs4], J.R. Esteban, A. Rodriguez and J.L. Vazquez [ERV1], [ERV2], K.M. Hui [Hu1], [Hu2], and L.F. Wu [W1], [W2], etc. Equation (0.1) arises in the model of thin films of fluid speading on a solid surface [G] when the fourth order term is neglected. It also arises in the study of the Ricci flow on surfaces [W1], [W2], and as the singular limit of the porous medium equation,

$$\begin{cases} u_t = \Delta \left(\dfrac{u^m}{m} \right), u > 0, & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T) \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \end{cases}$$

as $m \to 0$ [Hu2], [ERV2]. In [DP1] and [Hu1] P. Daskalopoulos and M.A. del Pino and K.M. Hui proved that corresponding to each $0 \leq u_0 \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $p > 1$, and $2 \leq f \in L^1(0, \infty)$ there exists a classical solution u of (0.1) in $\mathbb{R}^n \times (0, T)$ satisfying the mass loss equation,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u(x,t)\, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_0\, dx - 2\pi \int_0^t f(s)\, ds \quad \forall 0 \leq t < T \tag{0.2}$$

where $T > 0$ given by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_0\, dx = 2\pi \int_0^T f(s)\, ds \tag{0.3}$$

is the extinction time for the solution u. Note that the maximal solution of (0.1) is the solution of (0.1) that satisfies (0.2) with $f \equiv 2$. When $f \equiv \gamma > 2$ is a constant, the asymptotic behaviour of the solution u is studied by S.Y. Hsu in [Hs3] and [Hs4]. In [Hs3] S.Y. Hsu proved that if u_0 is radially symmetric and monotone decreasing and u is the solution of (0.1) in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T)$ that satisfies (0.2), (0.3), with $f \equiv 4$, then the rescaled solution

$$v(x,s) = \frac{u(x,t)}{T-t}, \quad , s = -\log(T-t)$$

will converge uniformly on every compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$ to the function

$$\frac{8\lambda}{(\lambda + |x|^2)^2}$$

as $s \to \infty$ for some constant $\lambda > 0$. For the general case $f \equiv \gamma > 2$ S.Y. Hsu [Hs4] proved that if u_0 is radially symmetric and monotone decreasing and u is the solution of (0.1) in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, T)$ that satisfies (0.2) and (0.3) with $f \equiv \gamma$ and

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{r u_r(r,t)}{u(r,t)} = -\gamma \quad \text{ uniformly on } [a,b] \quad \forall 0 < a < b < T$$

where T is given by (0.3) with $f \equiv \gamma$, then there exist unique constants $\alpha > 0$, $\beta > -1/2$, $\alpha = 2\beta + 1$, depending only on γ such that the rescaled function

$$v(y,s) = \frac{u(y/(T-t)^\beta, t)}{(T-t)^\alpha}$$

where

$$s = -\log\,(T-t)$$

will converge uniformly on every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$ to $\phi_{\lambda,\beta}(y)$ for some constant $\lambda > 0$ as $s \to \infty$ where $\phi_{\lambda,\beta}(y) = \phi_{\lambda,\beta}(|y|)$ is radially symmetric and satisfies the following O.D.E.

$$\frac{1}{r}\left(\frac{r\phi'}{\phi}\right)' + \alpha\phi + \beta r \phi' = 0 \quad \text{ in } (0, \infty)$$

with

$$\phi(0) = 1/\lambda, \phi'(0) = 0.$$

However as observed by J.R. King [K] using formal asymptotic analysis as t approaches T the vanishing behaviour for the finite mass solution of (0.1) which corresponds to the case $f \equiv 2$ is very different from the vanishing behaviour for the case $f \equiv \gamma > 2$. J.R. King find that for compactly supportly finite mass initial value the maximal solution of (0.1) behaves like

$$\frac{(T-t)^2}{\frac{T}{2}|x|^2 + e^{\frac{2T}{(T-t)}}}$$

in the inner region $(T-t)\log|x| \leq T$ and behaves like

$$\frac{2t}{|x|^2(\log|x|)^2}$$

in the outer region $(T-t)\log|x| \geq T$ as $t \nearrow T$. In [DP2] P. Daskalopoulos and M.A. del Pino give a rigorous proof of an extension of this formal result for radially symmetric initial value $u_0(r)$ satisfying the conditions,

$$u_0(x) = u_0(|x|) \text{ is decreasing on } r = |x| \geq r_1 \text{ for some constant } r_1 > 0 \tag{0.4}$$

$$u_0(x) = \frac{2\mu}{|x|^2(\log|x|)^2}(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } |x| \to \infty, \tag{0.5}$$

for some constant $\mu > 0$ and

$$R_0(x) := -\frac{\Delta \log u_0}{u_0} \geq -\frac{1}{\mu} \quad \text{on } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{0.6}$$

Note that (0.1) is equivalent to the Ricci flow equation ([W2])

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} g_{ij} = -2R_{ij} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T)$$

where $g_{ij}(t) = g_{ij}(x,t) = u(x,t)\delta_{ij}$ is an evolving metric on $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $R_{ij}(x,t)$ is the Ricci curvature of the metric $g_{ij}(t)$. Then the scalar curvature $R(x,t)$ with respect to the metric $g_{ij}(x,t)$ is given by

$$R(x,t) = -\frac{\Delta \log u}{u}.$$

Thus (0.6) says that the initial scalar curvature is greater than or equal to $-1/\mu$ on $\mathbb{R}^2$.

In [DS2] P. Daskalopoulos and N. Sesum extend the result to the case of compactly supported $0 \leq u_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$. However their proof of the behaviour of the

maximal solution in the outer region near the extinction time is very difficult and uses the Hamilton-Yau Harnack inequality [HY].

In this paper we will extend their result to the case of initial value $0 \le u_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ that satisfies (0.4), (0.5), and (0.6) for some constant $\mu \ge 0$ with the right hand side being replaced by $-\infty$ if $\mu = 0$ and

$$\operatorname{ess}\inf_{\overline{B}_{r_1}(0)} u_0 \ge \operatorname{ess}\sup_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{r_2}(0)} u_0 \tag{0.7}$$

for some constant $r_2 > r_1$. Note that (0.7) is automatically satisfied if u_0 has compact support in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We will prove the behaviour of the maximal solution in the outer region near the extinction time by elementary method without using the difficult Hamilton-Yau Harnack inequality for surfaces [HY]. We will also prove the behaviour of the maximal solution in the inner region as the extinction time is approached.

In this paper we will assume that the initial value u_0 satisfies $0 \le u_0 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$, (0.4), (0.5), (0.6) and (0.7) for some constants $r_2 > r_1 > 0$ and $\mu \ge 0$ with the right hand side being replaced by $-\infty$ if $\mu = 0$. We will assume that u is the maximal solution of (0.1) in $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T)$ that satisfies (0.2) with $f \equiv 2$ and

$$T = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u_0\, dx$$

for the rest of the paper. For any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $r_0 > 0$ let $B_{r_0}(x_0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x - x_0| < r_0\}$ and $B_{r_0} = B_{r_0}(0)$. Note that by [Hu1] u satisfies the Aronson-Bénilan inequality,

$$\frac{u_t}{u} \le \frac{1}{t} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T). \tag{0.8}$$

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 1 we will prove the behaviour of the maximal solution in the inner region. In section two we will prove the behaviour of the maximal solution in the outer region.

1 Inner region behaviour

In this section we will prove the behaviour of the maximal solution in the inner region near the extinction time using a modification of the argument of [DP2] and [DS2].

Lemma 1.1. *The solution u satisfies*

$$u(x,t) \ge u(y,t)$$

for any $t \in (0,T)$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $|y| \ge |x| + 2r_2$.

Proof: We will use a modification of the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [CF] to prove the lemma.

For any $x^0, y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ such that $|y^0| \geq |x^0| + 2r_2$ let Π be the hyperplane of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$ which are equidistance from x^0 and y^0. Then (cf. Lemma 2.1 of [CF]),

$$\Pi = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x \cdot (x^0 - y^0) = \tfrac{1}{2}(x^0 + y^0) \cdot (x^0 - y^0)\}$$

and

$$\operatorname{dist}(\Pi, \{0\}) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{|y^0|^2 - |x^0|^2}{|x^0 - y^0|} \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{|y^0|^2 - |x^0|^2}{|x^0| + |y^0|} \geq \frac{1}{2}(|y^0| - |x^0|) \geq r_2. \tag{1.1}$$

We write $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Pi = \Pi_+ \cup \Pi_-$ where Π_+ and Π_- are the two half-spaces with respect to Π with $0 \in \Pi_-$. By (1.1) $\{x^0\} \cup B_{r_2} \subset \Pi_-$ and $y^0 \in \Pi_+$. By rotation we may assume without loss of generality that

$$\begin{cases} \Pi = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 = a_0\} \\ \Pi_- = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 < a_0\} \\ \Pi_+ = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1 > a_0\} \end{cases}$$

where $a_0 = \operatorname{dist}(\Pi, \{0\})$. For any $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \Pi_-$ let $\widetilde{x} = (2a_0 - x_1, x_2)$ be the reflection point of x about Π. Then if $x \in \overline{B}_{r_1}$, by (0.7) and (1.2)

$$u_0(x) \geq u_0(\widetilde{x}). \tag{1.2}$$

If $x \in \Pi_- \setminus \overline{B}_{r_1}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 2a_0 - x_1 > |x_1| \quad &\Rightarrow \quad |\widetilde{x}| \geq |x| > r_1 \\ &\Rightarrow \quad u_0(x) \geq u_0(\widetilde{x}) \quad \text{(by (0.4))}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (1.2) holds for any $x \in \Pi_-$. By the maximum principle for the equation

$$u_t = \Delta \log u$$

in the half-space Π_- (cf. Lemma 2.5 of [ERV2]),

$$u(x,t) \geq u(\widetilde{x}, t) \quad \forall x \in \Pi_-, 0 < t < T.$$

Hence

$$u(x^0, t) \geq u(y^0, t)$$

and the lemma follows. □

By Lemma 1.1 for any $0 < t < T$ there exists $x_t \in \overline{B}_{2r_2}$ such that

$$u(x_t, t) = \max_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} u(x, t). \tag{1.3}$$

Similar to [DP2] we let

$$\overline{u}(x, \tau) = \tau^2 u(x, t), \qquad \tau = \frac{1}{T - t}, \tau > 1/T. \tag{1.4}$$

Then $\overline{u}$ satisfies [DP2],

$$\overline{u}_\tau = \Delta \log \overline{u} + \frac{2\overline{u}}{\tau} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (1/T, \infty). \tag{1.5}$$

Let $R_{max}(t) = \max_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} R(x,t)$ and let $W(t)$ be the width function with respect to the metric $g_{ij}(t)$ as defined by P. Daskalopoulos and R. Hamilton in [DH]. We recall a result of [DH].

Theorem 1.2. *[DH] There exist positive constants $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that*

(i) $c(T-t) \le W(t) \le C(T-t)$

(ii) $\frac{c}{(T-t)^2} \le R_{max}(t) \le \frac{C}{(T-t)^2}$

hold for any $0 < t < T$.

Let

$$\overline{R}(x,\tau) = -\frac{\Delta \log \overline{u}}{\overline{u}}.$$

Similar to the argument on P.862–863 of [DP2] by Theorem 1.2, (1.4) and the Aronson-Bénlian inequality (0.8),

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{\tau^2 t} \le \overline{R}(x,\tau) \le C \quad \forall (x,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (1/T,\infty), t = T - (1/\tau) \\ \Rightarrow \quad & -\frac{2}{\tau^2 T} \le \overline{R}(x,\tau) \le C \quad \forall (x,\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (2/T,\infty). \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

By (1.5) and (1.6),

$$C \ge \overline{R}(x,\tau) = -\frac{\Delta \log \overline{u}}{\overline{u}} = \frac{-\overline{u}_\tau + \frac{2\overline{u}}{\tau}}{\overline{u}} = -\frac{\overline{u}_\tau}{\overline{u}} + \frac{2}{\tau} \ge -\frac{2}{\tau^2 T} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (2/T,\infty) \tag{1.7}$$

$$\Rightarrow \qquad \frac{2}{\tau} + \frac{2}{\tau^2 T} \ge \frac{\overline{u}_\tau}{\overline{u}} \ge -C + \frac{2}{\tau} \ge -C \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (2/T,\infty). \tag{1.8}$$

Theorem 1.3. *For any sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, $\tau_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, let $x_{t_k} \in \overline{B}_{2r_2}$ be given by (1.3) with $t = t_k$ and*

$$\overline{u}_k(y,\tau) = \alpha_k \overline{u}(\alpha_k^{\frac{1}{2}} y + x_{t_k}, \tau + \tau_k), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tau > -\tau_k + T^{-1} \tag{1.9}$$

where

$$t_k = T - \tau_k^{-1} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$\alpha_k = 1/\overline{u}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k). \tag{1.11}$$

Then $\{\overline{u}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ *has a subsequence* $\{\overline{u}_{k_i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ *that converges uniformly on* $C^\infty(K)$ *for any compact set* $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ *as* $i \to \infty$ *to a positive solution* U *of equation*

$$U_\tau = \Delta \log U \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty) \tag{1.12}$$

with uniformly bounded non-negative scalar curvature and uniformly bounded width on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ *with respect to the metric* $\widetilde{g}_{ij}(t) = U(\cdot, t)\delta_{ij}$.

Proof: We first observe that by (1.5),

$$\overline{u}_{k,\tau} = \Delta \log \overline{u}_k + \frac{2\overline{u}_k}{\tau + \tau_k} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\tau_k + (1/T), \infty) \tag{1.13}$$

with

$$\overline{u}_k(0,0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{u}_k(y,0) \le 1 \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{1.14}$$

Since $(\log \overline{u}_k)_\tau = (\log \overline{u})_\tau$, by (1.8),

$$-C \le \frac{\overline{u}_{k,\tau}}{\overline{u}_k} \le \frac{2}{\tau + \tau_k} + \frac{2}{(\tau + \tau_k)^2 T} \le \frac{3T}{2} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (2/T - \tau_k, \infty). \tag{1.15}$$

For any $-\infty < a < 0 < b < \infty$ we choose $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $-\tau_k + (2/T) < a$ for any $k \ge k_0$. Then by (1.14) and (1.15) there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$\overline{u}_k(x,\tau) \le M_1 \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, a \le \tau \le b, k \ge k_0. \tag{1.16}$$

By (1.15) and (1.16) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$|\overline{u}_{k,\tau}(x,\tau)| \le CM_1 \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, a \le \tau \le b, k \ge k_0. \tag{1.17}$$

To complete the proof of the theorem we need the following two technical lemmas.

Lemma 1.4. *There exists a constant* $C_1 > 0$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} -C_1 R_1^2 M_1 + \log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau)}\right) \le & \frac{1}{|B_{R_1}|}\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} \log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x,\tau)}\right) dx \\ \le & C_1 R_1^2 M_1 + \log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau)}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{1.18}$$

holds for any $R_1 > 0$, $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $a \le \tau \le b$ *and* $k \ge k_0$.

Proof: We will use a modification of the proof of Lemma 6 of [V] and Lemma 2.6 of [Hu1] to proof the lemma. Let

$$G_{R_1}(x) = \log(R_1/|x - x_0|) + \frac{1}{2}R_1^{-2}(|x - x_0|^2 - R_1^2)$$

be the Green function for $B_{R_1}(x_0)$. Then $G_{R_1} \geq 0$ and $\Delta G_{R_1} = 2R_1^{-2} - 2\pi\delta_0$ where δ_0 is the delta mass at the origin. By (1.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} G_{R_1}(x)\overline{u}_{k,\tau}(x,\tau)\,dx \\
=&\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} G_{R_1}(x)\left(\Delta\log\overline{u}_k(x,\tau) + \frac{2\overline{u}_k(x,\tau)}{\tau+\tau_k}\right)dx \\
=&2\pi\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau)}\right) - \frac{1}{|B_{R_1}|}\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)}\log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x,\tau)}\right)dx\right) \\
&+\frac{2}{\tau+\tau_k}\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} G_{R_1}(x)\overline{u}_k(x,\tau)\,dx \qquad \forall\tau \geq -\tau_k + \frac{2}{T}, k \geq k_0. \qquad (1.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)} G_{R_1}(x)\,dx \leq CR_1^2,$$

by (1.16), (1.17), and (1.19) we get (1.18) and the lemma follows. □

Lemma 1.5. *For any $R_1 > 0$ there exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\sup_{\substack{|y|\leq R_1\\ a\leq\tau_1\leq b}} \overline{u}_k(y,\tau_1)^9 \leq C_2 \inf_{\substack{|x|\leq R_1\\ a\leq\tau_2\leq b}} \overline{u}_k(x,\tau_2) \quad \forall k \geq k_0.$$

Proof: Let $|x_0|, |y_0| \leq R_1$, $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [a,b]$ and $k \geq k_0$. Since $B_{R_1}(x_0) \subset B_{3R_1}(y_0)$, by Lemma 1.4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau_1)}\right) \leq& \frac{1}{|B_{R_1}|}\int_{B_{R_1}(x_0)}\log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x,\tau_1)}\right)dx + C_1M_1R_1^2 \\
\leq& \frac{9}{|B_{3R_1}|}\int_{B_{3R_1}(y_0)}\log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x,\tau_1)}\right)dx + C_1M_1R_1^2 \\
\leq& 9\log\left(\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(y_0,\tau_1)}\right) + C'M_1R_1^2
\end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C' = 82C_1$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau_1)} \leq \frac{e^{C'M_1R_1^2}}{\overline{u}_k(y_0,\tau_1)^9} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \overline{u}_k(y_0,\tau_1)^9 \leq e^{C'M_1R_1^2}\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau_1). \qquad (1.20)$$

Now by (1.15) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\overline{u}_k(x,\tau_1') \leq C\overline{u}_k(x,\tau_2') \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tau_1', \tau_2' \in [a,b], k \geq k_0. \qquad (1.21)$$

By (1.20) and (1.21),

$$\overline{u}_k(y_0,\tau_1)^9 \leq C_2\overline{u}_k(x_0,\tau_2)$$

holds for some constant $C_2 > 0$ and the lemma follows. □

We will now continue with the proof of Theorem 1.3. By (1.14) and Lemma 1.5 for any $R_1 > 0$ there exist constants $C_3 > 0$ and $C_4 > 0$ such that

$$C_3 \le \overline{u}_k(x, \tau_1) \le C_4 \quad \forall |x| \le R_0, a \le \tau \le b, k \ge k_0.$$

Hence the equation (1.13) for $\overline{u}_k$ is uniformly parabolic on $\overline{B}_{R_1} \times [a, b]$ for all $k \ge k_0$. By the parabolic Schauder estimates [LSU] $\overline{u}_k$ are uniformly Holder continuous in $C^{2\gamma,1\gamma}(\overline{B}_{R_1} \times [a, b])$ for any $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. By the Ascoli theorem and a diagonalization argument the sequence $\{\overline{u}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence which we may assume without loss of generality to be the sequence itself that converges uniformly in $C^{\infty}(K)$ as $k \to \infty$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ to some positive function U that satisfies (1.12).

Let

$$\overline{R}_k = -\frac{\Delta \log \overline{u}_k}{\overline{u}_k}. \tag{1.22}$$

Then $\overline{R}_k$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ as $k \to \infty$ to the scalar curvature $\widetilde{R} = -(\Delta \log U)/U$ of the metric $\widetilde{g}_{ij}(\tau) = U(\cdot, \tau)\delta_{ij}$. Note that by (1.6),

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{2}{(\tau + \tau_k)^2 T} \le \overline{R}_k(y, \tau) \le C \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (2/T - \tau_k, \infty) \\ \Rightarrow \quad 0 \le \widetilde{R}(y, \tau) \le C \quad \forall (y, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Finally similar to the argument on P.10 of [DS2] by Theorem 1.2 and an approximation argument the width function with respect to the metric $\widetilde{g}_{ij}(\tau) = U(\cdot, \tau)\delta_{ij}$ is uniformly bounded on $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$. □

Theorem 1.6. *For any sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\tau_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, let $\overline{u}_k$ be given by (1.9). Then $\{\overline{u}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence $\{\overline{u}_{k_i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ that converges uniformly in $C^{\infty}(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ as $i \to \infty$ to*

$$U(y, \tau) = \frac{1}{\lambda |y|^2 + e^{4\lambda\tau}}. \tag{1.23}$$

for some constant $\lambda > 0$.

Proof: By Theorem 1.3 $\{\overline{u}_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ has a subsequence $\{\overline{u}_{k_i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ that converges uniformly in $C^{\infty}(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ as $i \to \infty$ to a solution $U(y, \tau)$ of (1.12). By Theorem 1.3 and the result of [DS1],

$$U(y, \tau) = \frac{2}{\beta(|y - y_0|^2 + \delta e^{2\beta\tau})} \tag{1.24}$$

for some $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and constants $\beta > 0$, $\delta > 0$. Since $\overline{u}_{k_i}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ to $U(y,\tau)$ and $\overline{u}_k(y,0)$ attains its maximum at $y = 0$, $U(y,0)$ will attain its maximum at $y = 0$. Hence $y_0 = 0$. By (1.14),

$$U(0,0) = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 1 = \frac{2}{\beta\delta}. \tag{1.25}$$

By (1.24) and (1.25) we get (1.23) with $\lambda = \beta/2 > 0$. □

We now let

$$\alpha(\tau) = 1/\overline{u}(x_t, \tau) \tag{1.26}$$

where $\tau = 1/(T-t)$, $\tau > 1/T$, and $x_t \in \overline{B}_{2r_2}$ satisfies (1.3).

Lemma 1.7. *There exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 1/T$ such that*

$$\liminf_{\delta' \to 0^+} \left(\frac{\log \alpha(\tau) - \log \alpha(\tau - \delta')}{\delta'} \right) > \delta \quad \forall \tau \geq \tau_0. \tag{1.27}$$

Proof: Suppose (1.27) does not hold. Then there exist a sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\delta_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and a sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\tau_k > 1/T$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\tau_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, such that

$$\liminf_{\delta' \to 0^+} \left(\frac{\log \alpha(\tau_k) - \log \alpha(\tau_k - \delta')}{\delta'} \right) \leq \delta_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Hence for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\{\delta_{k,j}\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$, $\delta_{k,j} \to 0$ as $j \to \infty$, such that

$$\frac{\log \alpha(\tau_k) - \log \alpha(\tau_k - \delta_{k,j})}{\delta_{k,j}} < 2\delta_k \quad \forall k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{1.28}$$

Let t_k be given by (1.10) and let $t_{k,j} = T - (\tau_k - \delta_{k,j})^{-1}$. Let x_{t_k} and $x_{t_{k,j}}$ be given by (1.3) with $t = t_k, t_{k,j}$ respectively. Then by (1.26) and (1.28),

$$\frac{\log \overline{u}(x_{t_{k,j}}, \tau_k - \delta_{k,j}) - \log \overline{u}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k)}{\delta_{k,j}} < 2\delta_k \quad \forall k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{1.29}$$

Since

$$\overline{u}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k - \delta_{k,j}) \leq \max_{z \in \mathbb{R}^2} \overline{u}(z, \tau_k - \delta_{k,j}) = \overline{u}(x_{t_{k,j}}, \tau_k - \delta_{k,j}),$$

by (1.29),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\log \overline{u}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k - \delta_{k,j}) - \log \overline{u}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k)}{\delta_{k,j}} < 2\delta_k \quad \forall k, j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \\
\Rightarrow \quad &\frac{\overline{u}_\tau}{\overline{u}}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k) \geq -2\delta_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \quad \text{as } j \to \infty \\
\Rightarrow \quad &\frac{\Delta \log \overline{u}}{\overline{u}}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k) + \frac{2}{\tau_k} \geq -2\delta_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \qquad (\text{by (1.5)}) \\
\Rightarrow \quad &-\overline{R}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k) + \frac{2}{\tau_k} \geq -2\delta_k \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.30}$$

Let $\overline{u}_k$ be given by (1.9) with $\alpha_k = \alpha(\tau_k)$ and $\overline{R}_k$ be given by (1.22). Since $\overline{R}_k(0,0) = \overline{R}(x_{t_k}, \tau_k)$, by (1.30),

$$\overline{R}_k(0,0) \le 2\delta_k + \frac{2}{\tau_k} \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{1.31}$$

By Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6 $\overline{u}_k$ has a subsequence which we may assume without loss of generality to be the sequence itself that converges uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ as $k \to \infty$ to some function $U(y,\tau)$ given by (1.23) for some $\lambda > 0$. Then

$$\overline{R}_k(0,0) \to -\frac{\Delta \log U}{U}(0,0) = 4\lambda \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{1.32}$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ in (1.31), by (1.32) we get

$$4\lambda \le 0.$$

Since $\lambda > 0$, contradiction arises. Hence there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 1/T$ such that (1.27) holds. □

Corollary 1.8. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 1/T$ be as given by Lemma 1.7. Then*

$$\alpha(\tau) \ge \alpha(\tau_0)\, e^{\delta(\tau - \tau_0)} \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_0.$$

Proof: By Lemma 1.7 there exists constants $\delta > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 1/T$ such that (1.27) holds. Let $\tau > \tau_0$. By (1.27) there exists a constant $\delta_0' > 0$ such that

$$\log \alpha(\tau) - \log \alpha(\tau - \delta') > \delta\delta' \quad \forall 0 < \delta' \le \delta_0'. \tag{1.33}$$

Let

$$\delta_0 = \sup\{\delta_1 > 0 : \log \alpha(\tau) - \log \alpha(\tau - \delta') \ge \delta\delta' \quad \forall 0 < \delta' \le \delta_1\}.$$

Then by (1.33) $\delta_0 \ge \delta_0'$. We claim that $\delta_0 \ge \tau - \tau_0$. Suppose not. Then $\delta_0 < \tau - \tau_0$. By continuity,

$$\log \alpha(\tau) - \log \alpha(\tau - \delta') \ge \delta\delta' \quad \forall 0 < \delta' \le \delta_0. \tag{1.34}$$

Since $\tau - \delta_0 > \tau_0$, by (1.27) there exists a constant $\delta_1' > 0$ such that

$$\log \alpha(\tau - \delta_0) - \log \alpha(\tau - \delta_0 - \delta') > \delta\delta' \quad \forall 0 < \delta' \le \delta_1'. \tag{1.35}$$

By (1.34) and (1.35),

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \alpha(\tau) - \log \alpha(\tau - (\delta_0 + \delta')) > \delta(\delta_0 + \delta') \quad \forall 0 < \delta' \le \delta_1' \\ \Rightarrow \quad & \log \alpha(\tau) - \log \alpha(\tau - \delta') \ge \delta\delta' \qquad\qquad\qquad\quad \forall 0 < \delta' \le \delta_0 + \delta_1'. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the definition of δ_0. Hence $\delta_0 \ge \tau - \tau_0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \alpha(\tau) \ge \log \alpha(\tau_0) + \delta(\tau - \tau_0) \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_0 \\ \Rightarrow \quad & \alpha(\tau) \ge \alpha(\tau_0) e^{\delta(\tau - \tau_0)} \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_0 \end{aligned}$$

and the corollary follows. □

Corollary 1.9. *Let α_k be as in Theorem 1.3. Then $\alpha_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.*

Lemma 1.10. *Let τ_k, τ_{k_i}, α_k, $U(y,\tau)$ and $\lambda > 0$ be as in Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6. Let*

$$q_k(y,\tau) = \alpha_k \overline{u}(\alpha_k^{\frac{1}{2}} y, \tau + \tau_k) \tag{1.36}$$

where $\overline{u}$ is given by (1.4). Then $q_{k_i}(y,\tau)$ converges uniformly in $C^\infty(K)$ for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ to the function $U(y,\tau)$ as $\tau \to \infty$.

Proof: Let $\overline{u}_k(y,\tau)$ be given by (1.9) with x_{t_k}, t_k, given by (1.3) and (1.10). Then by Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.6 $\overline{u}_k(y,\tau)$ has a subsequence which we may assume without loss of generality to be the sequence itself that converges uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ for every compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ to the function $U(y,\tau)$ given by (1.23) for some $\lambda > 0$ as $k \to \infty$.

By Corollary 1.9 there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $\alpha_k \geq 1$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ be a compact set. Without loss of generality we may assume that $K = \overline{B}_{r_0} \times [\tau_0, \tau_0']$ for some $r_0 > 0$ and $\tau_0 < \tau_0'$. Then for any $|y| \leq r_0$ and $k \geq k_0$, we have

$$|y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}| \leq r_0 + 2r_2.$$

Since

$$q_k(y,\tau) = \overline{u}_k(y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}, \tau),$$

by Theorem 1.6,

$$q_k(y,\tau) - U(y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}, \tau) \to 0 \quad \text{uniformly on } C^\infty(K) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{1.37}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} |U(y,\tau) - U(y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}, \tau)| \leq & \frac{\lambda}{(\lambda\rho_0 + e^{4\lambda\tau})^2} ||y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}|^2 - |y|^2| \\ \leq & \lambda e^{-8\lambda\tau_0} \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} |x_{t_k}| (2|y| + \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} |x_{t_k}|) \\ \leq & 4\lambda e^{-8\lambda\tau_0} r_2 (r_0 + r_2) \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

holds for any $|y| \leq r_0$ and $\tau_0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_0'$ where ρ_0 is some constant between $|y|^2$ and $|y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}|^2$. Similarly for any γ_0, γ_1, $\gamma_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \cup \{0\}$,

$$|\partial_\tau^{\gamma_0} \partial_{y_1}^{\gamma_1} \partial_{y_2}^{\gamma_2} U(y,\tau) - \partial_\tau^{\gamma_0} \partial_{y_1}^{\gamma_1} \partial_{y_2}^{\gamma_2} U(y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}, \tau)| \leq C \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tag{1.38}$$

holds for some constant $C > 0$ and any $|y| \leq r_0$, $\tau_0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_0'$. Since $\alpha_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$ by Corollary 1.9, by (1.38)

$$U(y,\tau) - U(y - \alpha_k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x_{t_k}, \tau) \to 0 \quad \text{uniformly on } C^\infty(K) \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{1.39}$$

By (1.37) and (1.39) the theorem follows. □

Theorem 1.11. *Let $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence such that $\tau_k > 1/T$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $\tau_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Let*

$$\beta(\tau) = 1/\overline{u}(0,\tau), \tag{1.40}$$

$\beta_k = \beta(\tau_k)$ and

$$\overline{q}_k(y,\tau) = \beta_k \overline{u}(\beta_k^{\frac{1}{2}} y, \tau + \tau_k) \tag{1.41}$$

where $\overline{u}$ is given by (1.4). Then $\overline{q}_k$ has a subsequence $\overline{q}_{k_i}$ that converges uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ to some function $U(y,\tau)$ given by (1.23) for some $\lambda > 0$ as $\tau \to \infty$. Moreover $\beta_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.

Proof: Let $q_k(y,\tau)$ be given by (1.36) with α_k given by (1.11). Let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ be a compact set. As before we may assume without loss of generality that $K = \overline{B}_{r_0} \times [\tau_0, \tau_0']$ for some $r_0 > 0$ and $\tau_0 < \tau_0'$. By Lemma 1.10 $q_k(y,\tau)$ has a subsequence which we may assume without loss of generality to be the sequence itself that converges uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ as $k \to \infty$. Then

$$\frac{\alpha_k}{\beta_k} = q_k(0,0) \to U(0,0) = 1 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{1.42}$$

Hence there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and constants $c_2 > c_1 > 0$ such that

$$c_1 \le \frac{\beta_k}{\alpha_k} \le c_2 \quad \forall k \ge k_0. \tag{1.43}$$

Now

$$\overline{q}_k(y,\tau) = \frac{\beta_k}{\alpha_k} q_k((\beta_k/\alpha_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} y, \tau). \tag{1.44}$$

Then for any $|y| \le r_0$, by (1.43),

$$(\beta_k/\alpha_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} |y| \le c_2^{\frac{1}{2}} r_0 \quad \forall k \ge k_0.$$

Hence by Lemma 1.10

$$q_k((\beta_k/\alpha_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} y, \tau) \to U((\beta_k/\alpha_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} y, \tau) \tag{1.45}$$

uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ as $k \to \infty$. By (1.23), (1.42), (1.44), (1.45) and Corollary 1.9 the theorem follows. □

Lemma 1.12. *Let τ_k, τ_{k_i}, β_k, $U(y,\tau)$ and $\lambda > 0$ be as in Theorem 1.11. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and $M > 0$ there exist $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $C > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} \left| u(x, t_{k_i}) - \dfrac{(T - t_{k_i})^2}{\lambda |x|^2 + \beta_{k_i}} \right| < u(0, t_{k_i})\varepsilon & \forall |x| \le \beta_{k_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} M, i \ge n_1 \\ u(0, t_{k_i}) \le C(T - t_{k_i})^2 & \forall i \ge n_1. \end{cases} \tag{1.46}$$

where t_k is given by (1.10).

Proof: Let $\overline{q}_k$ be given by (1.41) and k_0 be as in the proof of Theorem 1.11. By Theorem 1.11 $\overline{q}_k$ has a subsequence $\overline{q}_{k_i}$ that converges uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ for any compact $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\infty, \infty)$ to some function $U(y,\tau)$ given by (1.23) as $k \to \infty$. Then there exists $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $k_i \geq k_0$ for all $i \geq n_1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \overline{q}_{k_i}(y,0) - \frac{1}{\lambda|y|^2+1} \right| < \varepsilon \quad \forall |y| \leq M, i \geq n_1 \\ \Rightarrow \quad & \left| \beta_{k_i} \tau_{k_i}^2 u(x,t_{k_i}) - \frac{1}{\lambda \beta_{k_i}^{-1}|x|^2+1} \right| < \varepsilon \quad \forall |x| \leq \beta_{k_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} M, i \geq n_1 \\ \Rightarrow \quad & \left| u(x,t_{k_i}) - \frac{(T-t_{k_i})^2}{\lambda|x|^2+\beta_{k_i}} \right| < u(0,t_{k_i})\varepsilon \quad \forall |x| \leq \beta_{k_i}^{\frac{1}{2}} M, i \geq n_1. \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 1.8 and (1.43) there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\beta_{k_i} > C \quad \forall i \geq n_1$$

and the lemma follows. □

Since the scalar curvature $R(x,t)$ satisfies

$$R_t = \Delta_{g(t)} R + R^2 \quad \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T)$$

where $\Delta_{g(t)} = \frac{1}{u}\Delta$ is the Laplace-Beltrami operator with respect to the metric $g_{ij}(t)$, by (0.6) and the maximum principle,

$$R(x,t) \geq -\frac{1}{t+\mu} \quad \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0,T). \tag{1.47}$$

Then by an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.5 of [DS2] but with Lemma 2.4, Lemma 3.4, and $k(t)$ in the proof there being replaced by Lemma 1.1, Lemma 1.12, and $1/[2(t+\mu)]$ we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1.13. *The constant λ in Theorem 1.11 satisfies*

$$\lambda \geq \frac{T+\mu}{2}.$$

By Lemma 1.13 and an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 3.5 of [DP2] we have the following lemma.

Lemma 1.14. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40). Then*

$$\liminf_{\tau \to \infty} \frac{\beta'(\tau)}{\beta(\tau)} \geq 2(T+\mu).$$

Corollary 1.15. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40). Then*

$$\beta(\tau) \geq e^{2(T+\mu)\tau + o(\tau)} \quad \text{ as } \tau \to \infty.$$

As in [DS2] we consider the cylindrical change of variables,

$$v(\zeta,\theta,t)=r^2u(r,\theta,t),\quad \zeta=\log r, r=|x|$$

and let

$$\widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau)=\tau^2v(\tau\xi,\theta,t),\quad \tau=1/(T-t),\tau\geq 1/T. \tag{1.48}$$

Then $\widetilde{v}$ satisfies

$$\tau\widetilde{v}_\tau=\frac{1}{\tau}(\log\widetilde{v})_{\xi\xi}+\tau(\log\widetilde{v})_{\theta\theta}+\xi\widetilde{v}_\xi+2\widetilde{v}\quad \text{ in } \mathbb{R}\times[0,2\pi]\times(1/T,\infty). \tag{1.49}$$

Lemma 1.16. *With the same notation as Theorem 1.11 for any $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $n_1\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ such that*

$$\left|\widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau_{k_i})-\frac{e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}}{\lambda e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}+\beta_{k_i}}\right|<\frac{e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}}{\beta_{k_i}}\varepsilon\quad \forall\xi\leq\frac{\log\beta_{k_i}}{2\tau_{k_i}},\theta\in[0,2\pi],i\geq n_1.$$

Proof: Let $\varepsilon>0$. By Lemma 1.12 there exists $n_1\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ such that (1.46) holds with $M=1$. Since

$$\widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau_{k_i})=\tau_{k_i}^2e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}u(e^{\tau_{k_i}\xi},\theta,t_{k_i})$$

where t_{k_i} is given by (1.10) with $k=k_i$, by (1.46),

$$\left|\widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau_{k_i})-\frac{e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}}{\lambda e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}+\beta_{k_i}}\right|<\tau_{k_i}^2e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}u(0,t_{k_i})\,\varepsilon=\frac{e^{2\tau_{k_i}\xi}}{\beta_{k_i}}\varepsilon$$

holds for any $\xi\leq\log\beta_{k_i}/(2\tau_{k_i})$, $\theta\in[0,2\pi]$ and $i\geq n_1$ and the lemma follows. □

By (0.5), Corollary 1.15, Lemma 1.16, and an argument similar to the proof of Proposition 3.7 of [DP2] we have the following result.

Proposition 1.17. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40). Then*

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{\log\beta(\tau)}{\tau}=2(T+\mu).$$

Proposition 1.18. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40). Then*

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty}\frac{\beta'(\tau)}{\beta(\tau)}=2(T+\mu). \tag{1.50}$$

Proof: Since

$$(\log\beta(\tau))_\tau=-(\log\overline{u}(0,\tau))_\tau=-\frac{\overline{u}_\tau(0,\tau)}{\overline{u}(0,\tau)}, \tag{1.51}$$

by (1.8) and (1.51),

$$C\geq\frac{\beta'(\tau)}{\beta(\tau)}\geq-\frac{2}{\tau^2T}-\frac{2}{\tau}\geq-\frac{3T}{2}\quad\forall\tau\geq 2/T. \tag{1.52}$$

By (1.52) any sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$, $\tau_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$, will have a subsequence $\{\tau_{k_i}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ such that the limit

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\beta'(\tau_{k_i})}{\beta(\tau_{k_i})}$$

exists. By the L'Hospital rule and Proposition 1.17,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\beta'(\tau_{k_i})}{\beta(\tau_{k_i})} = 2(T+\mu).$$

Since the sequence $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ is arbitrary, (1.50) holds. □

Proposition 1.19. *Let τ_k, $\overline{q}_k$, be as given in Theorem 1.11 and let*

$$\widetilde{R}_k = -\frac{\Delta \log \overline{q}_k}{\overline{q}_k} \tag{1.53}$$

Then

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \widetilde{R}_k(0,0) = 2(T+\mu).$$

Proof: By (1.5) $\overline{q}_k$ satisfies

$$\overline{q}_{k,\tau} = \Delta \log \overline{q}_k + \frac{2\overline{q}_k}{\tau+\tau_k} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2 \times (-\tau_k + (1/T), \infty). \tag{1.54}$$

By (1.41), (1.51) and (1.54),

$$\widetilde{R}_k(0,0) = \frac{\beta'(\tau_k)}{\beta(\tau_k)} + \frac{2}{\tau_k}. \tag{1.55}$$

Letting $k \to \infty$ in (1.55), by Proposition 1.18 the corollary follows. □

Corollary 1.20. *The constant λ in Theorem 1.11 is equal to $(T+\mu)/2$.*

Proof: Let τ_k, $\overline{q}_k$, $\overline{q}_{k_i}$, and $U(y,\tau)$ be as in Theorem 1.11 and let $\widetilde{R}_k$ be given by (1.53). Then by Theorem 1.11,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} \widetilde{R}_{k_i}(0,0) = -\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{\Delta \log \overline{q}_{k_i}}{\overline{q}_{k_i}}(0,0) = -\frac{\Delta \log U}{U}(0,0) = 4\lambda. \tag{1.56}$$

By Proposition 1.19 and (1.56) the corollary follows. □

By Theorem 1.11 and Corollary 1.20 we have the following main theorem of this section.

Theorem 1.21. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40) and let*

$$\overline{q}(y,\tau) = \beta(\tau)\overline{u}(\beta(\tau)^{\frac{1}{2}}y,\tau)$$

where $\overline{u}$ is given by (1.4). Then $\overline{q}(y,\tau)$ converges uniformly on $C^\infty(K)$ for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ to the function

$$U_\mu(y) = \frac{1}{\frac{(T+\mu)}{2}|y|^2 + 1}$$

as $\tau \to \infty$.

Since

$$(\log \beta(\tau))_\tau = \overline{R}(0,\tau) - \frac{2}{\tau},$$

by (1.5), by Proposition 1.18 we have the following result.

Proposition 1.22. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40). Then*

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \overline{R}(0,\tau) = 2(T+\mu).$$

By Theorem 1.21 and an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 1.16 we have the following result.

Lemma 1.23. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40) and let $\widetilde{v}$ be given by (1.48). Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $\tau_0 > 1/T$ such that*

$$\left|\widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau) - \frac{e^{2\tau\xi}}{\frac{T+\mu}{2}e^{2\tau\xi} + \beta(\tau)}\right| < \frac{e^{2\tau\xi}}{\beta(\tau)}\varepsilon \quad \forall \xi \le \frac{\log\beta(\tau)}{2\tau}, \theta \in [0,2\pi], \tau \ge \tau_0.$$

By Corollary 1.15, Proposition 1.17 and Lemma 1.23 we get the following result.

Corollary 1.24. *Let $\beta(\tau)$ be given by (1.40) and let $\widetilde{v}$ be given by (1.48). Then*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\xi^-}\int_0^{2\pi} \widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau)\,d\theta\,d\xi \to 0 \quad \text{as } \tau\to\infty$$

and

$$\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \widetilde{v}(\xi,\theta,\tau) = 0 \quad \text{uniformly on } (-\infty,\xi^-]\times[0,2\pi]$$

for any $\xi^- < T+\mu$.

2 Outer region behaviour

In this section we will prove the behaviour of the maximal solution in the outer region without using the Hamilton-Yau Harnack inequality for surfaces [HY]. By (0.5), Proposition 1.17, Lemma 1.23, Corollary 1.24 and an argument similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [DS2] we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\xi(\tau) = (\log \beta(\tau))/2\tau$ with $\beta(\tau)$ given by (1.40). Let $\widetilde{v}$ be given by (1.48). Then there exists constants $C_1 > 0$, $C_2 > 0$, $C_3 > 0$ and $\tau_0 > 1/T$ such that the following holds.*

(i) $\widetilde{v}(\xi, \theta, \tau) \le C_1 \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, \theta \in [0, 2\pi], \tau \ge 1/T$

(ii) $\widetilde{v}(\xi, \theta, \tau) \ge \frac{C_2}{\xi^2} \quad \forall \xi \ge \xi(\tau), \theta \in [0, 2\pi], \tau \ge \tau_0$

(iii) $\widetilde{v}(\xi, \theta, \tau) \le \frac{C_3}{\xi^2} \quad \forall \xi > 0, \theta \in [0, 2\pi], \tau \ge \tau_0.$

Moreover

$$\xi(\tau) = T + \mu + o(1) \qquad \text{as } \tau \to \infty.$$

Lemma 2.2. *For any $b > a > T + \mu$, there exist constants $C > 0$ and $\tau_1 > 1/T$ such that*

$$\max_{a \le \xi \le b} \left| \int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})_\xi(\xi, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \right| \le C \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_1. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof: Let $\delta = (a - (T + \mu))/2$. By direct computation the scalar curvature R in polar coordinates satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & R(e^{\tau\xi}, \theta, t) = -\frac{(\log \widetilde{v})_{\xi\xi} + \tau^2 (\log \widetilde{v})_{\theta\theta}}{\widetilde{v}}(\xi, \theta, \tau) \\ \Rightarrow \quad & (\log \widetilde{v})_{\xi\xi}(\xi, \theta, \tau) + \tau^2 (\log \widetilde{v})_{\theta\theta}(\xi, \theta, \tau) = -R(e^{\tau\xi}, \theta, t)\widetilde{v}(\xi, \theta, \tau) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\tau = 1/(T - t)$. Integrating (2.2) over $(\theta, \xi) \in [0, 2\pi] \times [\xi_1, \xi_2]$, $T + \mu + \delta \le \xi_1 < \xi_2 \le b + 1$, by (1.47) and Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})_\xi(\xi_2, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta = & - \int_{\xi_1}^{\xi_2} \int_0^{2\pi} R(e^{\tau\xi}, \theta, t)\widetilde{v}(\xi, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta\, d\xi \\ & + \int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})_\xi(\xi_1, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \\ \le & C_1 + \int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})_\xi(\xi_1, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \quad \forall \tau > 1/T \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

for some constant $C_1 > 0$. Let $\tau_0 > 1/T$ be as given in Lemma 2.1. By Lemma 2.1 there exists $\tau_1 > \tau_0$ such that

$$\xi(\tau) < T + \mu + \delta \quad \forall \tau \ge \tau_1. \tag{2.4}$$

Integrating (2.3) over $\xi_1 \in (a-\delta, a)$, by (2.4) and Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})_\xi(\xi_2, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \leq & \frac{1}{\delta}\left(C_1 + \int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})(\xi_1, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \Big|_{\xi_1=a-\delta}^{\xi_1=a}\right) \\ \leq & \frac{C'}{\delta} \qquad \forall a \leq \xi_2 \leq b, \tau \geq \tau_1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Integrating (2.3) over $\xi_2 \in (b, b+1)$, by (2.4) and Lemma 2.1,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})_\xi(\xi_1, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \geq & -C_1 + \int_0^{2\pi} (\log \widetilde{v})(\xi_1, \theta, \tau)\, d\theta \Big|_{\xi_1=b}^{\xi_1=b+1} \\ \geq & -C'' \qquad \forall a \leq \xi_1 \leq b, \tau \geq \tau_1. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

By (2.5) and (2.6) we get (2.1) and the lemma follows. □

We now let

$$w(\xi, \theta, s) = \widetilde{v}(\xi, \theta, \tau) \tag{2.7}$$

with

$$s = \log \tau = -\log(T - t).$$

Then as in [DS2] by (1.49),

$$w_s = e^{-s}(\log w)_{\xi\xi} + e^s (\log w)_{\theta\theta} + \xi w_\xi + 2w \quad \text{ in } \mathbb{R} \times [0, 2\pi] \times (-\log T, \infty). \tag{2.8}$$

Theorem 2.3. *As $\tau \to \infty$, the function $\widetilde{v}$ given by (1.48) converges to the function*

$$V(\xi) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{2(T+\mu)}{\xi^2} & \forall \xi > T + \mu \\ 0 & \forall \xi < T + \mu. \end{cases}$$

Moreover the convergence is uniform on $(-\infty, a]$ for any $a < T + \mu$ and on $[\xi_0, \xi_0']$ for any $\xi_0' > \xi_0 > T + \mu$.

Proof: By Corollary 1.24 we only need to prove the convergence of the function $\widetilde{v}$ to $2(T+\mu)/\xi^2$ for $\xi > T + \mu$. Let τ_0, τ_1, be given by Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 respectively. Let $s_0 = \max(\log \tau_0, \log \tau_1)$ and $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be a sequence such that $s_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Let

$$w_k(\xi, \theta, s) = w(\xi, \theta, s + s_k) \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi, s \geq -\log T - s_k. \tag{2.9}$$

Then by (2.8),

$$w_{k,s} = e^{-(s+s_k)}(\log w_k)_{\xi\xi} + e^{s+s_k}(\log w_k)_{\theta\theta} + \xi w_{k,\xi} + 2w_k \tag{2.10}$$

in $\mathbb{R}\times[0,2\pi]\times(-\log T-s_k,\infty)$. Since

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} u(x,t)\,dx = 4\pi(T-t) \quad \forall 0<t<T,$$

by (1.48), (2.7) and (2.9),

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi = 4\pi \quad \forall s>-\log T-s_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{2.11}$$

Let

$$W_k^b(\eta,s) = \int_\eta^b\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi \quad \forall b\ge\eta>T+\mu, s>-\log T-s_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}^+ \tag{2.12}$$

and

$$W_k(\eta,s) = \int_\eta^\infty\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi \quad \forall \eta>T+\mu, s>-\log T-s_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}^+.$$

Then

$$(W_k^b)_\eta(\eta,s) = -\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(\eta,\theta,s)\,d\theta \quad \forall b\ge\eta>T+\mu, s>-\log T-s_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{2.13}$$

Hence by (2.11) and Lemma 2.1 there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$|W_k^b(\eta,s)|, |(W_k^b)_\eta(\eta,s)|\le C \quad \forall b\ge\eta>T+\mu, s>s_0-s_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{2.14}$$

Now by (2.10), (2.12) and (2.13),

$$\begin{aligned}
(W_k^b)_s(\eta,s) =& e^{-(s+s_k)}\int_\eta^b\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_{\xi\xi}(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi + \int_\eta^b\int_0^{2\pi}\xi w_{k,\xi}(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi\\
&+2W_k^b\\
=& e^{-(s+s_k)}\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_\xi(b,\theta,s)\,d\theta - e^{-(s+s_k)}\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_\xi(\eta,\theta,s)\,d\theta\\
&+b\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(b,\theta,s)\,d\theta - \eta\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(\eta,\theta,s)\,d\theta + W_k^b\\
=& e^{-(s+s_k)}\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_\xi(b,\theta,s)\,d\theta - e^{-(s+s_k)}\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_\xi(\eta,\theta,s)\,d\theta\\
&+b\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(b,\theta,s)\,d\theta + \eta(W_k^b)_\eta(\eta,s) + W_k^b.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

By (2.14), Lemma 2.1, and Lemma 2.2 for any $a\in(T+\mu,b]$ there exists a constant $C_{a,b}>0$ such that

$$|(W_k^b)_s(\eta,s)|\le C_{a,b}(1+b^{-1}+\eta) \quad \forall a\le\eta\le b, s>s_0-s_k, k\in\mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{2.16}$$

By (2.14) and (2.16) the sequence $\{W_k^b\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is equi-Holder continuous on $[a,b]\times[-s',\infty]$ for any $a\in(T+\mu,b]$, $s'>0$, and k large such that $s_k-s_0>s'$.

We choose a sequence $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ of monotonically increasing sequence such that $b_i>T+\mu$ for any $i\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ and $b_i\to\infty$ as $i\to\infty$. By the Ascoli theorem and a diagonalization argument the sequence $\{W_k^{b_1}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has a subsequence $\{W_{j_{1,k}}^{b_1}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that $W_{j_{1,k}}^{b_1}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $(T+\mu,b_1]\times(-\infty,\infty)$ to some function $W^{b_1}\in C((T+\mu,b_1]\times(-\infty,\infty))$ as $k\to\infty$.

Similarly the sequence $\{W_{j_{1,k}}^{b_2}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has a subsequence $\{W_{j_{2,k}}^{b_2}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $j_{1,1}<j_{2,1}$ such that $W_{j_{2,k}}^{b_2}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $(T+\mu,b_2]\times(-\infty,\infty)$ to some function $W^{b_2}\in C((T+\mu,b_2]\times(-\infty,\infty))$ as $k\to\infty$. Repeating the above argument for any $i\geq 2$ the sequence $\{W_{j_{i-1,k}}^{b_i}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has a subsequence $\{W_{j_{i,k}}^{b_i}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ with $j_{i-1,1}<j_{i,1}$ such that $W_{j_{i,k}}^{b_i}$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $(T+\mu,b_i]\times(-\infty,\infty)$ to some function $W^{b_i}\in C((T+\mu,b_i]\times(-\infty,\infty))$ as $k\to\infty$.

For any $k\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ let $j_k=j_{k,1}$. Then $\{j_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ is a subsequence of $\{j_{i,k}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ for any $i\in\mathbb{Z}^+$. Hence for any $i\in\mathbb{Z}^+$, the sequence $\{W_{j_k}^{b_i}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $(T+\mu,b_i]\times(-\infty,\infty)$ to W^{b_i} as $k\to\infty$. Thus we may assume without loss of generality that for any $i\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ $\{W_k^{b_i}\}_{k=1}^\infty$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $(T+\mu,b_i]\times(-\infty,\infty)$ to W^{b_i} as $k\to\infty$.

Now by Lemma 2.1 for each $s\in\mathbb{R}$, $w_k(\cdot,\cdot,s)$ will have a subsequence which we may assume without loss of generality to be the sequence itself that converges weakly in $L^\infty(K)$ to some non-negative function $\overline{w}(\cdot,\cdot,s)$ as $k\to\infty$ for any compact set $K\subset[T+\mu,\infty)\times[0,2\pi]$. Putting $b=b_i$ and letting $k\to\infty$ in (2.12),

$$W^{b_i}(\eta,s)=\int_\eta^{b_i}\int_0^{2\pi}\overline{w}(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi\quad\forall b\geq\eta\geq T+\mu,s\in\mathbb{R},i\in\mathbb{Z}^+. \tag{2.17}$$

By (2.17) as $i\to\infty$, W^{b_i} will increase monotonically to the function,

$$W(\eta,s):=\int_\eta^{\infty}\int_0^{2\pi}\overline{w}(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi\quad\forall\eta\geq T+\mu,s\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{2.18}$$

By Lemma 2.1,

$$\overline{w}(\xi,\theta,s)\leq\frac{C}{\xi^2}\quad\forall\xi>0,\theta\in[0,2\pi],s\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{2.19}$$

Then by (2.19),

$$0\leq W(\eta,s)-W^{b_i}(\eta,s)\leq\int_{b_i}^{\infty}\int_0^{2\pi}\overline{w}(\xi,\theta,s)\,d\theta\,d\xi\leq\int_{b_i}^{\infty}\int_0^{2\pi}\frac{C}{\xi^2}\,d\theta\,d\xi\leq\frac{C'}{b_i} \tag{2.20}$$

holds for any $s\in\mathbb{R}$ and $i\in\mathbb{Z}^+$.

Claim 1: W_k converges uniformly to W on every compact set $K\subset(T+\mu,\infty)\times(-\infty,\infty)$ as $k\to\infty$.

Proof of Claim 1: Let K be a compact subset of $(T+\mu,\infty)\times(-\infty,\infty)$. By Lemma 2.1, (2.19) and (2.20),

$$\begin{aligned}\|W_k - W\|_{L^\infty(K)} \le& \|W_k - W_k^{b_i}\|_{L^\infty(K)} + \|W_k^{b_i} - W^{b_i}\|_{L^\infty(K)} + \|W^{b_i} - W\|_{L^\infty(K)}\\ \le& \int_{b_i}^{\infty}\int_0^{2\pi} \frac{C}{\xi^2}\,d\theta\,d\xi + \|W_k^{b_i} - W^{b_i}\|_{L^\infty(K)} + \frac{C'}{b_i}\\ \le& \frac{C''}{b_i} + \|W_k^{b_i} - W^{b_i}\|_{L^\infty(K)} \qquad\qquad \forall i\in\mathbb{Z}^+. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Letting $k\to\infty$ in (2.21),

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{k\to\infty}\|W_k - W\|_{L^\infty(K)} \le \frac{C''}{b_i} \quad \forall i\in\mathbb{Z}^+\\ \Rightarrow\quad &\lim_{k\to\infty}\|W_k - W\|_{L^\infty(K)} = 0 \quad \text{as } i\to\infty\end{aligned}$$

and Claim 1 follows.

By Corollary 1.24, Lemma 2.1, (2.7), (2.9), (2.11) and Claim 1,

$$W((T+\mu)^+, s) = 4\pi \quad \forall s\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{2.22}$$

Let $a_2 > a_1 > T+\mu$ and $s_1' < s_2'$. We choose $k_0\in\mathbb{Z}^+$ such that $s_1' > s_0 - s_k$ for any $k\ge k_0$. Then by (2.15) for any $e^{-s}\zeta_0\in[a_1,a_2]$, $b > a_2$, $s_2'\ge s\ge s_1'$ and $k\ge k_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{ds}(e^{-s}W_k^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s))\\ =&e^{-s}(W_{k,s}^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s) - e^{-s}\zeta_0 W_{k,\eta}^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s) - W_k^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s))\\ =&e^{-(2s+s_k)}\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_\xi(b,\theta,s)\,d\theta - e^{-(2s+s_k)}\int_0^{2\pi}(\log w_k)_\xi(e^{-s}\zeta_0,\theta,s)\,d\theta\\ &+ be^{-s}\int_0^{2\pi} w_k(b,\theta,s)\,d\theta \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2,

$$\left|\frac{d}{ds}(e^{-s}W_k^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s))\right| \le C_b e^{-(2s+s_k)} + C\frac{e^{-s}}{b} \tag{2.24}$$

for some constants $C_b > 0$ depending on b and $C > 0$. By (2.24) for any $s_2' > s_1' > s_0 - s_k$, $\zeta_0 > e^{s_2'}(T+\mu)$ and $b > e^{-s_1'}\zeta_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}|e^{-s_1'}W_k^b(e^{-s_1'}\zeta_0,s_1') - e^{-s_2'}W_k^b(e^{-s_2'}\zeta_0,s_2')| =& \left|\int_{s_1'}^{s_2'}\frac{d}{ds}(e^{-s}W_k^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s))\,ds\right|\\ \le& \max_{s_1'\le s\le s_2'}\left|\frac{d}{ds}(e^{-s}W_k^b(e^{-s}\zeta_0,s))\right|(s_2'-s_1')\\ \le& \left(C_b e^{-(2s_1'+s_k)} + C\frac{e^{-s_1'}}{b}\right)(s_2'-s_1') \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

Putting $b = b_i$ and letting first $k \to \infty$ and then $i \to \infty$ in (2.25),

$$e^{-s_1'} W(e^{-s_1'}\zeta_0, s_1') = e^{-s_2'} W(e^{-s_2'}\zeta_0, s_2') \tag{2.26}$$

holds for any $s_1', s_2' \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\zeta_0 > \max(e^{s_1'}, e^{s_2'})(T+\mu)$.

Let $\eta, \overline{\eta} > T+\mu$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\zeta_0 = e^s \eta$ and choose $\overline{s}$ such that $\overline{\eta} = e^{-\overline{s}}\zeta_0$. Then $\eta/\overline{\eta} = e^{\overline{s}-s}$. Hence by (2.26),

$$\eta W(\eta, s) = \overline{\eta} W(\overline{\eta}, \overline{s}) \quad \forall \eta, \overline{\eta} > T+\mu, s, \overline{s} \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.27}$$

Letting $\overline{\eta} \to T+\mu$ in (2.27), by (2.22) we get

$$W(\eta, s) = \frac{4\pi(T+\mu)}{\eta} \quad \forall \eta > T+\mu, s \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.28}$$

We now fix $s \in \mathbb{R}$. By (2.28) and an argument similar to the proof on P.588 of [DS2] $w_k(\xi, \theta, s)$ converges to $2(T+\mu)/\xi^2$ in $L^p([\xi_0, \infty) \times [0, 2\pi])$ as $k \to \infty$ for any $p \geq 1$ and $\xi_0 > T+\mu$. Hence by passing to a subsequence we may assume without loss of generality that

$$w_k(\xi, \theta, s) \to \frac{2(T+\mu)}{\xi^2} \quad \text{a.e. } (\xi, \theta) \in (T+\mu, \infty) \times [0, 2\pi] \quad \text{as } k \to \infty. \tag{2.29}$$

Let

$$Z_k(\xi, s) = \int_0^{2\pi} \log w_k(\xi, \theta, s)\, d\theta.$$

Claim 2: For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the sequence $Z_k(\xi, s)$ has a subsequence that converges uniformly on $[a, b]$ for any $b > a > T+\mu$ to

$$Z(\xi, s) = 2\pi \log \frac{2(T+\mu)}{\xi^2}. \tag{2.30}$$

Proof of Claim 2: We will use a modification of the proof of Lemma 4.10 of [DS2] to prove the claim. By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 for any $b > a > T+\mu$ there exist constants $C > 0$ and $k_1 = k_1(s) \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ such that

$$\begin{cases} |Z_{k,\xi}(\xi, s)| = \left| \displaystyle\int_0^{2\pi} (\log w_k(\xi, \theta, s))_\xi \, d\theta \right| \leq C & \forall a \leq \xi \leq b, k \geq k_1 \\ |Z_k(\xi, s)| \leq C & \forall a \leq \xi \leq b, k \geq k_1. \end{cases} \tag{2.31}$$

By (2.31), the Ascoli theorem, and a diagonalization argument the sequence $Z_k(\xi, \theta, s)$ has a subsequence that converges uniformly on $[a, b]$ for any $b > a > T+\mu$ to some function $Z(\xi, s)$ which is continuous in $\xi > T+\mu$. Without loss of generality we may

assume that $Z_k(\xi, s)$ converges uniformly on $[a, b]$ for any $b > a > T + \mu$ to $Z(\xi, s)$ as $k \to \infty$. Since

$$\int_\eta^{\eta+A} \int_0^{2\pi} \log w_k(\xi, \theta, s)\, d\theta\, d\xi \to \int_\eta^{\eta+A} Z(\xi, s)\, d\xi \quad \forall \eta > T + \mu, A > 0 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty,$$

by (2.29), Lemma 2.1, and the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem,

$$\int_\eta^{\eta+A} Z(\xi, s)\, d\xi = \int_\eta^{\eta+A} \int_0^{2\pi} \log \frac{2(T+\mu)}{\xi^2}\, d\theta\, d\xi = 2\pi \int_\eta^{\eta+A} \log \frac{2(T+\mu)}{\xi^2}\, d\xi \quad (2.32)$$

holds for any $\eta > T + \mu$, $A > 0$. Dividing both sides of (2.32) by A and letting $A \to 0$ we get (2.30) and Claim 2 follows.

By Lemma 1.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
w_k(\eta, \theta, s) =& \widetilde{v}(\eta, \theta, \tau_k(s)) = \tau_k(s)^2 v(\tau_k(s)\eta, \theta, \tau_k(s)) \\
=& \tau_k(s)^2 e^{2\tau_k(s)\eta} u(e^{\tau_k(s)\eta}, \theta, t_k(s)) \\
\le& \tau_k(s)^2 e^{2\tau_k(s)\eta} u(e^{\tau_k(s)\eta} - 2r_2, \theta, t_k(s)) \\
=& \tau_k(s)^2 e^{2\tau_k(s)\eta} u(e^{\tau_k(s)\eta}(1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta}), \theta, t_k(s)) \\
=& \frac{\tau_k(s)^2}{(1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta})^2} v(\tau_k(s)\eta + \log(1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta}), \theta, t_k(s)) \\
=& (1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta})^{-2} \widetilde{v}(\eta + \tau_k(s)^{-1} \log(1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta}), \theta, \tau_k(s)) \\
=& (1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta})^{-2} w_k(\eta + \tau_k(s)^{-1} \log(1 - 2r_2 e^{-\tau_k(s)\eta}), \theta, s)
\end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

for all k large satisfying $e^{\tau_k(s)\eta} > 2r_2$ where

$$\tau_k(s) = e^{s+s_k} \quad \text{and } t_k(s) = T - \tau_k(s)^{-1}.$$

By Claim 2, (2.33), and an argument similar to the proof on P.590 of [DS2], $w_k(\eta, \theta, s)$ converges uniformly on every compact subset of $(T + \mu, \infty) \times [0, 2\pi]$ to

$$\frac{2(T+\mu)}{\eta^2}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Since the sequence s_k is arbitrary, $\widetilde{v}(\eta, \theta, \tau)$ converges unfiormly to $2(T + \mu)/\eta^2$ on every compact subset of $(T + \mu, \infty) \times [0, 2\pi]$ as $\tau \to \infty$ and the theorem follows. □

References

[CF] D.G. Aronson and L.A. Caffarelli, *The initial trace of a solution of the porous medium equation*, Transactions A.M.S. 280 (1983), no. 1, 351–366.

[DH] P. Daskalopoulos and R. Hamilton, *Geometric estimates for the logarithmic fast diffusion equation*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 12 (2004), nos. 1–2, 143–164.

[DP1] P. Daskalopoulos and M.A. del Pino, *On a singular diffusion equation*, Comm. Anal. Geom. 3 (1995), no. 3, 523–542.

[DP2] P. Daskalopoulos and M.A. del Pino, *Type II collapsing of maximal solutions to the Ricci flow in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linaire 24 (2007), 851–874.

[DS1] P. Daskalopoulos and N. Sesum, *Eternal solutions to the Ricci flow on* $\mathbb{R}^2$, Int. Math. Res. Not. 2006, Art. ID 83610, 20 pp.

[DS2] P. Daskalopoulos and N. Sesum, *Type II extinction profile of maximal solutions to the Ricci flow equation*, J. Geom. Anal. 20 (2010), no. 3, 565–591.

[ERV1] J.R. Esteban, A. Rodriguez and J.L. Vazquez, *The fast diffusion equation with logarithmic nonlinearity and the evolution of conformal metrics in the plane*, Advances in Differential Equations 1 (1996), no. 1, 21–50.

[ERV2] J.R. Esteban, A. Rodriguez and J.L. Vazquez, *The maximal solution of the logarithmic fast diffusion equation in two space dimensions*, Advances in Differential Equations 2 (1997), no. 6, 867–894.

[G] P.G. de Gennes, *Wetting: statics and dynamics*, Rev. Modern Phys. 57 (1985), no. 3, 827–863.

[HY] R. Hamilton and S.T. Yau, *The Harnack estimate for the Ricci flow - revisited*, Asian J. Math 1 (1997), no. 3, 418–421.

[Hs1] S.Y. Hsu, *Large time behaviour of solutions of the Ricci flow equation on* R^2, Pacific J. Math 197 (2001), no. 1, 25–41.

[Hs2] S.Y. Hsu, *Asymptotic profile of a singular diffusion equation as* $t \to \infty$, Nonlinear Analysis TMA 48 (2002), no. 6, 781–790.

[Hs3] S.Y. Hsu, *Asymptotic behaviour of solutions of the equation* $u_t = \Delta \log u$ *near the extinction time*, Advances in Differential Equations 8 (2003), no. 2, 161–187.

[Hs4] S.Y. Hsu, *Behaviour of solutions of a singular diffusion equation near the extinction time*, Nonlinear Analysis TMA 56 (2004), no. 1, 63–104.

[Hu1] K.M. Hui, *Existence of solutions of the equation* $u_t = \Delta \log u$, Nonlinear Analysis, TMA 37 (1999), no. 7, 875–914.

[Hu2] K.M. Hui, *Singular limit of solutions of the equation* $u_t = \Delta(u^m/m)$ *as* $m \to 0$, Pacific J. Math. 187 (1999), no. 2, 297–316.

[K] J.R. King, *Self-similar behaviour for the equation of fast nonlinear diffusion*, Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London, Series A 343 (1993), 337–375.

[LSU] O.A. Ladyzenskaya, V.A. Solonnikov, and N.N. Uraltceva, *Linear and quasi-linear equations of parabolic type*, Transl. Math. Mono. Vol 23, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., U.S.A., 1968.

[V] J.L. Vazquez, *Nonexistence of solutions for nonlinear heat equations of fast-diffusion type*, J. Math. Pures Appl. 71 (1992), 503–526.

[W1] L.F. Wu, *A new result for the porous medium equation derived from the Ricci flow*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 28 (1993), 90–94.

[W2] L.F. Wu, *The Ricci flow on* R^2, Comm. Anal. Geom. 1 (1993), 439–472.